

Application No. 10/686,298
Reply to Office Action of April 19, 2006

4

Docket No.: GGG-10402/29

REMARKS

By this amendment, the limitations of claims 2 and 3 have been moved into claim 1, and claims 2 and 3 have been canceled. In addition, the limitations of claims 8 and 9 have been moved into claim 7, and claims 8 and 9 have been canceled.

Claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Larrable ('915) in view of Rudy ('816). The Examiner has failed to establish *prima facie* obviousness, however, because there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine these references, and even if they were combined, features of Applicant's invention as claimed would still not be present. Note, for example, that claim 1 and claim 7 both include the limitation of "the form configured to be grasped by a user through the film . . .". Claim 7 includes the additional limitation of a role of firm, flexible film having "an adhesive surface to be used as a hand covering." Neither Larrable nor Rudy teach or suggest any such features. Accordingly, *prima facie* obviousness has not been established for this reason alone. But in addition, the Examiner's interpretation of "interlocking chains or opposing belts," now a feature of both claims 1 and 7, is misinterpreted relative to the teachings of the references. Although Rudy teaches a drive belt 28, there is nothing interlocking or opposing, and, as conceded by the Examiner, the arrangement has nothing whatsoever to do with holding the side edges of a flexible film. Rather, as pointed out by the Examiner, the belt of Rudy is used to move a carriage assembly across the material to be severed. As such, the Examiner's argument that "it would have been obvious to modify the carriage system of Larrable to incorporate a looped chain and/or belt to convey the cutter across the material as taught by Rudy," is not only without foundation or support, but does not address the apparatus claimed by Applicant. Namely, the use of interlocking chains or belts to hold the side edges of the material to be used as a hand covering.

Based on the foregoing amendments and comments, Applicant believes that all claims are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner should have any questions or comments, Applicant's below-signed representative may be contacted at the telephone/facsimile numbers provided below.

Application No. 10/686,298

5

Docket No.: GGG-10402/29

Reply to Office Action of April 19, 2006

Dated: July 12, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

John G. Posa

Registration No.: 37,424

GIFFORD, KRASS, GROH, SPRINKLE,

ANDERSON & CITKOWSKI, P.C.

2701 Troy Center Drive, Suite 330

Post Office Box 7021

Troy, Michigan 48007-7021

(734) 913-9300

(734) 913-6007 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant

GIFFORD, KRASS, GROH, SPRINKLE, ANDERSON & CITKOWSKI, P.C. 2701 TROY CENTER DR., SUITE 330, P.O. BOX 7021 TROY, MICHIGAN 48007-7021 (248) 647-6000